



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

COPY MAILED

SEP 29 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

In re Patent No. 7,457,014 :
Issued: November 25, 2008 :
Application No. 10/811,934 : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Filed: March 30, 2004 :
Dkt. No.: 251166US2 :

This is a decision on the "PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.705(d) AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT," filed January 26, 2009.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment (PTA) is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,457,014 on November 25, 2008. The patent issued with a PTA of 1,032 days. The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See, 37 CFR 1.705(d). Patentees request that the adjustment be increased from 1,032 days to 1,275 days.

Patentees request recalculation of the patent term adjustment based on the decision in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentees contend that pursuant to Wyeth, a PTO delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) overlaps with a delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) only if the delays occur on the same day.

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

Patentees do not dispute that the total period of Office delay is the sum of the period of three years delay and the period of examination delay, to the extent that these periods of delay are not overlapping. However, in effect, patentees contend that only a portion of the three year delay period overlaps with the period of examination delay. Accordingly, patentees submit that the total period of adjustment for Office delay is 1,275 days (deemed by applicants to be the sum of the period of three year delay (606 days) and the period of examination delay (1,032 days), reduced by 363 days of overlap). As such, patentees assert entitlement to a patent term

adjustment of 1,275 days (606 days *plus* 1,032 days *less* zero days of overlap *less* zero days of applicant delay).

The Office agrees that as of the time that at the time of issuance of the patent, the application was pending three years and 606 days after its filing date. The three years delay commences the day after the date that is three years after the date that an application is filed, and ends the date that the patent issues, notwithstanding any periods of time excluded pursuant to U.S.C.

154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii). The Office agrees that certain action was not taken within a specified time frame, and, thus, the entry of a period of adjustment of 1,032 days is correct. At issue is whether patentees should accrue an additional 606 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent as well as 1,032 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that the period of 606 days of delay in issuing the patent overlaps with the period of examination delay of 1,032 days. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 35 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule, 65 Fed. Reg.

56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See, also, Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See, also, Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

The current wording of § 1.703(f) was revised in response to the misinterpretation of this provision by a number of Patentees. The rule was slightly revised to more closely track the corresponding language of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). The relevant portion differs only to the extent that the statute refers back to provisions of the statute whereas the rule refers back to sections of the rule. This was not a substantive change to the rule nor did it reflect a change of the Office's interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). As stated in the Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed. The grounds specified in these sections cover the A) guarantee of prompt Patent and Trademark Office responses, B) guarantee of no more than 3-year application pendency, and C) guarantee or adjustments for delays due to interference, secrecy orders and appeals. A section by section analysis of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) specifically provides that:

Section 4402 imposes limitations on restoration of term. In general, pursuant to [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(2)(A)-(C), total adjustments granted for restorations under [35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)] are reduced as follows: (1) To the extent that there are multiple grounds for extending the term of a patent that may exist simultaneously (e.g., delay due to a secrecy order under [35 U.S.C.] 181 and administrative delay under [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(1)(A)), the term should not be extended for each ground of delay but only for the actual number of days that the issuance of a patent was delayed; See, 145 Cong. Rec. S14,718¹.

As such, the period for over three-year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the date on which the application was filed overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within

¹ The AIPA is title IV of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999 (S. 1948), which was incorporated and enacted as law as part of Pub. L. 106-113. The Conference Report for H.R. 3194, 106th Cong. 1st Sess. (1999), which resulted in Pub. L. 106-113, does not contain any discussion (other than the incorporated language) of S. 1948. A section-by-section analysis of S. 1948, however, was printed in the Congressional Record at the request of Senator Lott, See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,708-26 (1999) (daily ed. Nov. 17, 1999).

specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the filing date of the application.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office, March 30, 2004, to the date the patent issued on November 25, 2008. Prior to the issuance of the patent, 1,032 days of patent term adjustment were accorded for the Office failing to respond within a specified time frame during the pendency of the application. All of the 606 days for Office delay in issuing the patent overlap with the 1,032 days of Office delay. During that time, the issuance of the patent was delayed by 1,032 days. The Office did not delay 1,032 days and also delay an additional 606 days. Accordingly, as the 606 days attributable to the delay in the issuance of the patent overlaps with the adjustment of 1,032 days attributable to grounds specified in § 1.702(a), entry of both periods is not warranted.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

The Office acknowledges submission of the required application fee of \$200.00.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions